

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 13, and 14; claims 10 and 22 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11 13-21, and 23 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2-8, 10, 14-20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, the Applicant has amended claims 2 and 14 to replace the recitation “consists of” with the word “includes”. Additionally, the Applicant has canceled claims 10 and 22. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-8 and 14-20 is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morales (US 4,954,032) in view of Newell (US 3,169,407). The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. Support for this amendment is found in FIG. 3C and page 5, lines 6-11. Additionally, claim 10 has been canceled. The Examiner’s consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections and submits the following remarks for the Examiner’s favorable reconsideration. The Applicant has further amended independent claim 1 to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the

reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. **Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (MPEP 2143).** In that regard, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's two references still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the presently pending independent claims.

The present invention recites a screw arrangement having a cavity for insertion of a threaded axle along which the screw arrangement is movably arranged, wherein the screw arrangement includes a first resilient part to eliminate an axial allowance and a second resilient part to eliminate a radial allowance. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the screw cavity at its inside is equipped with **stationary semi-spheres** that follow the turn of the threads of the threaded axle.

The Examiner stated that Newell teaches a screw arrangement cavity at its inside which is equipped with six semi-spheres that follow the turn of threads of a threaded axle. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization. The Applicant has reviewed the figures and the specification describing the subject "semi-spheres." The specification in Newell describes the semi-spheres as "...[a] plurality of spherical ended plugs 27 each having a shank 28 that is press fitted into an inner race 29 of a conventional ball bearing..." (Col. 5, lines 53-61). The description of Newell's semi-spheres is not equivalent to the applicant's claimed structure; "...the screw cavity at its inside being equipped with semi-spheres...". However, to further define the present invention, the Applicant has amended claim 1 which now recites that the semi-spheres are **stationary**. As discussed in Newell, the plugs roll along a single path passing through the point 39 rather than along two paths as do the bearing balls 3 (See col. 6, lines 16-28). Furthermore, Newell discusses the rotation of the plug 27 (see Col. 6, lines 10-15). Therefore, Newell does not disclose a **stationary** semi-sphere. In contrast, the Applicant's invention provides a stationary semi-sphere to provide a sufficient steering means of the screw part along the axis (see page 5, lines 6-11 and page 7, lines 9-13).

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the stationary semi-sphere recited in claim 1 is simply not taught or suggest by either Morales or Newell as recited in claim 1. Claims 2-9 and 11 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further

limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-9 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morales in view of Newell and further in view of Schmid et al. (US 5,039,966). The Applicant has amended independent claim 13 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. Support for this amendment is found in FIG. 3C and page 5, lines 6-11. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 22 has been canceled.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite that the semi-spheres are stationary. As discussed above, Newell does not teach or suggest stationary semi-sphere spheres. The plugs 27 of Newell rotate and move. The addition of Schmid does not make up the missing element. Therefore, the combination of Morales, Newell and Schmid, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the elements recited in claim 13. Claims 14-21 and 23 depend from amended claim 13 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 13. Therefore, the allowance of claims 13-21 and 23 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted.



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 2, 2007

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com